

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Bbx 1450 Alexaddia, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,125		08/25/2003	Steve Grove	2043.102US1	3210
49845	7590	12/27/2005		EXAMINER	
SCHWE	GMAN, L	UNDBERG, WOES	SSNER & KLUTH/EBAY	TRUONG, CAM Y T	
P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2162	
				DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Evaminar Initiated Intension, Summans	10/648,125	GROVE ET AL.
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Cam Y T. Truong</u> .	(3)	
(2) Larry Johnson (Attorney).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>16 December 2005</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 103(a) Rejection discussed		
Claims discussed:		·
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summare 	e examiner will provide a writto ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	•	
Cam nus/		
	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative will add new claimed limitation "allowing a user to modify to the content of the proposed listing and displaying the proposed listing after modifying" in independent claims for further consideration. Barts and Ojha did not teach the above claimed limitation..